COURT REPORTER: Janet Shaddix Elling, RPR

		2
SPEAKER	INDEX	PAGE
Tracy Smetana		3
Julie Ann Smith		14
David Moeller		21
Bill Storm		28
Carol Overland		48
Meloy Mattfield		51
Dean Sedgwick		54
William Yuenger		62
Mark Lofgren		64
Roger Webber		67
Sally Sedgwick		68
Carol Overland		70
Tom Boland		71
Roger Webber		73
Ryan Reed		73
Meloy Mattfield		74
Dean Sedgwick		75
Tom Boland		78

MS. TRACY SMETANA: Good evening, everyone and thank you for coming. My name is Tracy Smetana, I'm with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission.

And we are here for the public information and scoping meeting for Minnesota Power's proposed Great Northern Transmission Line Project.

I've identified the Public Utilities

Commission's docket number on this opening slide,
that's sort of the key to finding information with
our office. So if your contacting us or one of the
other departments working on this project, it's
useful to include that docket number in your
communication.

We're going to start off talking a little bit about the route permit roles and process. And that will be the Public Utilities Commission and also a representative from the U.S. Department of Energy. We'll ask Minnesota Power to provide a brief summary of the project. The Department of Commerce and the Department of Energy will talk about the environmental review. And then, of course, the main event is your comments and questions, that's the main reason we're here

tonight.

Just briefly a little bit about the Public Utilities Commission. I know many folks may have not worked with us or dealt with our office in the past and so I thought it would be useful to know a little bit about who we are and what we do. We regulate various aspects of the energy industry, including permitting for transmission lines, pipelines and so on.

We have five commissioners that are appointed by the governor, and they serve staggered terms. It's full-time employment for those folks. And then we have about 50 staff in our agency as well. So we're a pretty small agency.

A little bit about who's who in this process. First off, we have the applicant. That's the term we use for the company that's applying for the route permit, so in this case that's Minnesota Power. We also have the Department of Commerce, their Energy Environmental Review and Analysis group is responsible for doing the environmental review for this project.

Later on in the process we'll have the Office of Administrative Hearings assign an administrative law judge to this project to gather

the facts, sort through the evidence, and ultimately write a report and some recommendations for the Public Utilities Commission to consider.

We also have the U.S. Department of Energy and their job is to lead the environmental review when a presidential permit application has been filed. And so Julie Ann Smith will talk to us more about that in a moment.

At the Public Utilities Commission, there are two different staff members that you may interact with as part of the process. The first is our energy facilities planner. Their role is to deal with more of the technical aspects of the project, help build the record, sort through the facts, and provide the Commissioners with information on the various alternatives and different impacts that could happen as a result.

And then also the public advisor. I'm the public advisor and my job is to work with folks and help you figure out when you can weigh in on the process, what types of information we're seeking from you, that type of thing. And just so you know, the Public Utilities Commission staff, we are a neutral party. We're not advocating for any one group or party as part of the process. We don't

give legal advice, so we're not an advocate for anyone.

So why is it the Public Utilities

Commission is involved in this particular project?

Well, the statutes and rules define this line as a high voltage transmission line, and so the statutes and rules say that the company needs a route permit before they can build it. And so the route permit is going to figure out where would it go if they're going to build it. And I've included information on the statutes and rules, so if you're looking for some good bedtime reading, this might be a good place to start.

This particular project also needs what we call a certificate of need, again because of the size and the capacity of the project that they're proposing. And so that answers the question is the project needed. So it's sort of a two-part issue. One is is the project needed; if yes, where is it going to go. And some of you may have attended, meetings in the past dealing with the question of need. This time around we're talking about the question of route, where is it going to go.

So how does the Public Utilities

Commission figure out a route? There are some

factors that the statutes and rules require the Commission to consider. What the statutes and rules don't do is rank them or weight them or prioritize them. And so as we work through this process, various folks, yourself included, will have the opportunity to talk about which of these factors you think is most important. You know, one might outrank the other for you, but someone else might feel differently. And so in the end ultimately it's the Public Utilities Commission that will sort of determine that ranking and which factors outweigh one another in determining where it actually will be built if the permit is issued.

So now this is a list, if you have the presentation you have the list there in front of you. But you can see it's a pretty comprehensive list of items that the Commission is required to consider in making that decision.

If a route permit is issued there are some terms that might be useful for you to know. The first is the permitted route. And that's the location from point A to point B of the transmission line. And that route width can be pretty wide, up to one and a quarter miles. And the reason for that is to allow for some flexibility, you know, somebody

says, hey, I'm going to put up a new building right here and nobody knew about it before, maybe the company has the opportunity to move it to a slightly different spot within that same route area.

We're going to get smaller as we go down the page, so the next one is the right-of-way. That's the actual land that's needed to build and operate the line. And so that's going to be a smaller chunk of land. And then we get down even smaller yet and that's the anticipated alignment. When the route permit is issued that will be included, where the company believes the line will actually go. And, again, we call it anticipated because until it's in the ground we don't actually know, things could change.

Some other terms that you might find helpful if a route permit is issued. There is an easement, and that would be the land negotiation between the applicant -- again, that's Minnesota Power -- and the landowner where the line is going to go.

In this particular case Minnesota state statutes also allow for the company to take land using eminent domain if the negotiations fail and what have you. And in that case those decisions

would be handled through the court system, it would not come through our office.

There's also a statute that some people call Buy the Farm. In certain situations a landowner may require that the company purchase their land, or these types of lands. Again, I'm not an attorney, I'm not giving you legal advice, I just want to throw it out there that these are some issues that might come up throughout the course of this process. There is a handout on the table when you came in that talks in further detail about these issues and so if you have further questions about that that would be a really good place to start.

So here is a picture that shows what this process looks like for the Public Utilities

Commission to review this application. So you can see we're on the second box right now, the public information and scoping meetings. So you can see there's a lot of other boxes that follow and there's a number of opportunities for folks to have a chance to weigh in either by attending meetings or submitting written comments and so on.

And here's the list version of kind of the same thing. So if you're more of a list person you might prefer to follow along on this slide. It

gives you kind of the estimated project timeline. So you can see we're on the third box right now, the public information and scoping meetings, July 2014. And as you work your way down through the various steps, the route permit decision is expected in October 2015 and, again, this is estimated, so it certainly is subject to change based on the complexities of the case, new information that comes to light, and so on.

So I mentioned one of the ways that folks can weigh in and share your input on this project is through submitting written comments. And so what the Public Utilities Commission will do is issue a notice saying, hey, we're taking comments right now. And so I just wanted to show you an example of a previous notice that we issued in this particular case back in April when we were looking for information on a different issue than we are today. Just so I can point out some of the key pieces that you would want to note if you receive one of these in the mail and you want to weigh in.

So the first, here it is again, that docket number. That's sort of the key to everything in our world so it's very helpful to include that.

You also notice there's a comment period. And so

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

20

24

25

there's a deadline. Once that deadline is past, information that is received is not considered as part of the record. And so it's really important if you have great ideas that you want to share that you pay attention to those deadlines, because we do need to hold to those so we can keep the project moving in accordance with the statutes and rules.

Now, the other piece that's important is what are the topics open for comment. As we work through this process, we're going to ask questions about different things. You can see back in April and May we were asking about, did the company send everything they need to call this application Do we want an advisory task force set up? complete? If somebody weighs in on those questions now, it's not really helpful because we've already made decisions on that. And so Mr. Storm from the Department of Commerce is going to talk about the types of questions that we're looking for help with right now, and those are also included in the notice that you may have received in the mail or seen in the newspaper.

So if you're thinking, hmm, this is all really good stuff, but I'd like to stay informed, how do I get more information. If you want to see

everything that's been submitted in this docket, you can do that, it's on our website. We have what we call an eDocket system where everything is filed. So the company's application is there. If you submit a comment, those will be there. That notice that I showed you a moment ago, that's in there. So everything that happens in this case, it's sort of our electronic tracking system for all of it. And it's open and available to the public. And so I've included instructions on how to find that information here for both the route docket -- and that's the 14-21 that's listed first -- and also for that certificate of need case that I mentioned that's related to this as well, and that's 12-1163.

We also keep a project mailing list so that you can receive information either by U.S. mail or e-mail when there are opportunities to weigh in. So when we have meetings, when there are comment periods, when the environmental review documents become available. And you can sign up for that by filling out one of those orange cards at the table when you came in, I know a number of you did that. And if you forget tonight or you decide later that you want to be added to it, you can always contact our office.

We also have an e-mail subscription service that will send you an e-mail every time something new comes. Now, if you're not a super e-mail fan this probably is not the choice for you because it can result in a lot of e-mails, but in any case, these are the instructions to subscribe to receive an e-mail every time something comes in.

And then I also just included a picture of what that screen looks like when you go to subscribe, because a lot of people say it's not very user-friendly so I figured if you had a picture that shows you what you need to enter when you get there, that would be helpful.

And as I mentioned, there are two different contacts at the Public Utilities

Commission that you might find useful. The first is me, again, my name is Tracy, I'm the public advisor with the Commission. We also have an energy facilities planner, Michael Kaluzniak, and he is here in the back and he deals with more of the technical aspects of the project. If you have questions for either of us, we'll be around after the meeting is over and we'll be happy to answer your questions.

And, with that, I'm going to turn it over

to Julie Ann Smith with the Department of Energy.

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: Hello, good evening. My name is Julie Ann Smith, I work for the United States Department of Energy with the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.

I would also like to thank you very much for taking your time out of your schedule and your life today to attend this meeting. Your presence and input are vital to a robust public participation process.

This is a scoping meeting, which means it is about me, the DOE, listening to you and learning from you. The Department of Energy needs to hear what issues you think we should consider in conducting our environmental analysis.

The reason that we are here is because Minnesota Power is proposing to construct the Great Northern Transmission Line Project, an international transmission line, and has asked the Department of Energy for a permit to cross the U.S./Canadian border. Minnesota Power submitted a presidential permit application to the Department of Energy in April of 2014.

Before any electric energy transmission facility can be built across the U.S. international

border, the project must obtain a presidential permit from the Department of Energy. A Department of Energy presidential permit authorizes a company to construct, operate, maintain, and connect electric transmission facilities at the border.

The DOE is involved in this proceeding for one reason. The proposed transmission line would cross the international border. If this line did not cross the international border the Department of Energy would not be here right now.

The DOE has no authority to site this line. Only the State of Minnesota, specifically the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, has that authority. The Department of Energy does not convey the right of eminent domain with its presidential permit, nor can the DOE address the issue of compensation for land that would be impacted by the Great Northern project.

However, before the DOE can issue this kind of permit, it must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act or, as we like to call it, NEPA. NEPA is the federal law that serves as the nation's basic charter for environmental protection. It requires that all agencies consider the potential impacts of their proposed actions.

NEPA is based on a set of principles.

That first principle and the main one guiding our involvement and being here with you today is based on full disclosure and public participation. We also must explore alternatives to the action that is proposed, including a no-action alternative. For the Department of Energy, that would mean not issuing a presidential permit.

We also have to assess potential impacts with rigor and with an apples-to-apples comparison between alternatives. We have to consider mitigation or ways to reduce or avoid impacts and we need to weigh options and explain the decisions that are being made.

Overall, NEPA promotes better agency decision-making and provides you the opportunity not only to learn about the federal agency's proposed actions, but to provide timely information and comments to us on our proposed actions.

In terms of process, NEPA has been referred to as an umbrella statute, in that it allows agencies and developers to comply with numerous individual environmental, health and safety related laws for which we are responsible. We analyze potential effects from federal agency

actions to numerous resource types. Not only natural resources, but we also include human issues. For instance, environmental justice concerns as an example. And those would be covered in one analytical document.

For this proposed project, the Department of Energy has determined that the appropriate level of NEPA analysis is an environmental impact statement, or an EIS. An EIS from our point of view tells the story of the proposed project in a very clear way. The Great Northern EIS will analyze the foreseeable environmental impacts that might flow from our granting of a presidential permit. The EIS will also identify steps that might be needed to mitigate environmental impacts.

We are preparing this EIS along with the State of Minnesota to make this a more efficient review process and to have it make more sense to the public and to ourselves.

The other federal agencies involved in the preparation of the EIS are U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Paul District, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. They have permitting authority or oversight authority for proposed facilities within their respective jurisdictions. The Army Corps of

Engineers is currently a cooperating agency to the Department of Energy and the DOC in preparation of this EIS and will be involved.

Again, I want to stress that we are here to listen and to get your comments and your suggestions for the issues we should be addressing in the EIS. We would also like to know any alternative routes or route segments for this proposed project. And Bill Storm from the Department of Commerce will cover that in more detail in a little bit.

As you can see, just a little bit above, the overall EIS process is sort of what you can do to participate over the next year or so. We are here in the blue circle, scoping. So once the scoping period closes in mid-August, we will get to working at preparing the draft environmental impact statement and this will take us several months.

Once the draft is completed it will be made public and posted on our website and will be distributed to everyone our on the mailing list. If you want to be on the mailing list, again, you can sign up at the table when you entered and by putting your name on the yellow cards and submitting it to the folks out there, or you can also sign up after

the fact if you think about it at either the

Department of Commerce, the PUC, or the DOE website.

We have several points of access.

There will be at least a 45-day comment period for you to review the draft EIS once we make it public and for you to make comment. During the comment period on the draft, you will be able to submit comments in writing or by e-mail, as we're accepting them now. And I will also be back here in Minnesota to hold public hearings to receive oral comments on the draft EIS.

After the close of the comment period on the draft, we will prepare the final. Every comment received on the draft EIS will be included in the final EIS and we will respond in the document to every comment received. When the final EIS is completed, it will be sent to everyone, again, on the mailing list, and by posting it on our websites.

By law, the Department of Energy may not make a final decision on the Great Northern

Transmission Line presidential permit application until 30 days after publication of the EIS. That last box on the diagram represents that decision, it would be issued in the Federal Register publicly, and it is called the record of decision.

At the completion of the EIS process, the Department may or may not issue a presidential permit. If the DOE were to issue a presidential permit, the transmission line and associated facilities could not be built unless and until all other state, local, and federal permits are obtained.

For this meeting, a court reporter is here to write down and make sure that we record your statements accurately. Whether or not you choose to speak, you are invited to send us written comments. All comments, written or oral, are treated the same and have equal weight. We will accept comments through mid-August and we will consider those comments that are submitted after that date to the extent that we can.

If you have any specific questions about the project or elements of the project and the design itself, representatives of Minnesota Power are here. We have a nice mapping station to help assist you if you would like to see specific locations and visual aids to help you think about alternatives and/or to answer your questions.

So, please, we encourage you to take advantage of these resources, we encourage you to

submit comments. And, once again, thank you very much for coming.

And for your reference -- I always forget this part -- the DOE, the federal EIS website, the address is listed up here. That is one point that you can submit a comment. You can submit comments to myself, you can also submit comment on the environmental review to Bill Storm. I just want to sort of state very clearly, you only need to submit your comment to either one of us once. They will be captured in the state and federal record. You can submit them to both of us if you'd like, but just know if you submit it once it will be part of the record and we will have that as part of what we need to inform our decision.

And so, with that said, I'm going to turn it over to Dave Moeller from Minnesota Power for a little more specifics on the project.

MR. DAVID MOELLER: Good evening. My name is David Moeller, I'm an attorney for Minnesota Power. I'm based in Duluth, Minnesota where Minnesota Power is headquartered. We serve lots of northern Minnesota, including here in Bigfork, the Iron Range, the city of Duluth. And then we have other service territories throughout northern

Minnesota.

As Julie and Tracy both said, thank you for coming tonight to the meeting, it's important to get your input and get your thoughts on the process and the environmental scope, so we appreciate that.

In addition to myself, we have other Minnesota Power people here to answer questions, including Jim Atkinson, who is the routing lead on the project. And you've probably talked to Jim at various open houses or public forums that I'll mention as we go through the slides. And as Julie said, also we have a GIS mapping station down in the front here, you can talk to the folks after the hearing and get maps of any of your land or alternatives if you'd like to look at different possibilities for routing.

For Minnesota Power, the Great Northern
Transmission Line is part of a larger plan. We file
an integrated resource plan with the Minnesota
Public Utilities Commission every couple years and
this was part of our last resource plan that was
approved by the Commission. And it's an important
part as we look to transform not only our energy
supply but the nation's energy supply to be less
dependent on coal.

When I started at the company in 2005 we were about a 95 percent coal utility. Today we're down to about 80, 75 percent, as we've added more renewables, especially wind renewables, to meet the Minnesota requirements. And our goal long term is to be about a third coal, a third natural gas, and a third renewable, which includes Manitoba Hydro under that bucket.

We also see the Manitoba Hydro resource as being an excellent resource to serve our customers. It's dependable, flexible, and efficient, especially for customers that operate around the clock.

For Minnesota Power, the needs for this transmission line, the needs are really threefold.

One is to create diversity or have resource diversity as we become less coal dependent. And not only for Minnesota Power, but for the region as a whole as other utilities use the transmission line to receive power from Manitoba Hydro.

It also helps increasing demand, so that as a utility in Minnesota we have to meet our obligations to our customers, and as growth is happening, especially on the Iron Range, it's important to have additional generating resources.

And finally reliability. Adding another 500 kV line between Manitoba and Minnesota, the key reliability component to keep the lights on, as well as just another interconnection that provides this resource for Minnesota and for the region as a whole.

As we developed the Great Northern

Transmission Line, we had to go through various
steps to get to where we are today and to get to
having route alternatives. So that the last step
was apply for permits, but there's many steps prior
to that, including what are the critical paths for
getting this project developed, what are the
reviewing and fatal flaws, places we can't go or you
shouldn't route a transmission line. Defining what
the study area is looking at different options in
that study area.

And then engaging stakeholders multiple times. We've been in other areas throughout northern Minnesota for open houses, for public meetings, for engaging landowners, stakeholders, local officials, as well as state and federal agencies.

And all that has led to determining what a range of alternatives are. And then on April 15, 2014, we applied for permits, both the state -- the

state route permit, and the Department of Energy for the presidential permit that we're here for tonight.

When we developed those range of alternatives, we had to look at both the opportunities and the strengths. And I apologize, the print is very small, but the handout has it as well. And as you can see there's many more constraints where it's difficult or challenging to route transmission lines versus opportunities where there's either an existing line or existing corridors or other places that provide better opportunities for routing a transmission line.

We have a number of slides here just showing the different stakeholder outreach and the different public meetings and the open houses that we have gone through in the two-year process leading up to the filing of the applications.

So in round one we determined locations, which has been narrowed down to different corridors and eventually to different route alternatives in determining additional routing for different open houses for round three. That ultimately led to what we had as preferred and alternative routes.

We have two routes here. The blue route is our preferred route and then our orange route is

an alternative route that we think both are feasible, but we have a preference for the blue route for a few reasons. But the Commission could consider both of those routes when they make their final decision on routing, as well as other segments or other alternatives.

As we've gone through this process, we've narrowed down kind of what the project is, from a study of over 19,700 miles, to corridors of over 7,900 miles, to different route options and route alternatives to about 534 miles, to two route alternatives that we propose that are both around 220 miles. And then ultimately when the project gets constructed the right-of-way that will be required is about a 200-foot right-of-way and that will equal about eight square miles of actual right-of-way for the transmission line.

This slide just shows the number of open houses and input that we received at various locations, including here in Bigfork. We were also -- in February we were out in northern Minnesota, I Falls and closer to here in and Grand Rapids. Receiving comments, the state was out here in that time receiving comments on the scoping decision for its certificate of need environmental

report that was issued a couple weeks ago by Bill Storm from the Minnesota Department of Commerce. So there's been, besides the unofficial open house process, there's also a state process that was started on the certificate of need side.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And that certificate of need, along with other permits, are the five major permits that Minnesota Power will need to obtain before we start construction on this project, in addition to some other minor permits. But the certificate of need, as Tracy mentioned, is a requirement that the project would need, that's a determination by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission. route permit is also by the PUC. The federal presidential permit, as Julie discussed, is issued by the Department of Energy. We will also need to acquire a section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the Clean Water Act for wetlands and any other water impacts. And then finally we'll need a license from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources for crossing state lands.

So, once again, thank you for coming tonight. We appreciate the turnout and I'll turn it over to Mr. Storm, who will have additional comments

from the Minnesota Department of Commerce.

MR. BILL STORM: Good afternoon. My name is Bill Storm, I'm with the Department of Commerce.

The Department of Commerce's role in this whole endeavor is we facilitate and conduct the environmental review. The Public Utilities

Commission, as Tracy stated, they're the final decision-makers. So when we go through this whole process, the process that Tracy laid out, at the end the Public Utilities Commission will be making the final decision.

And that decision will have three parts to it, or thereabouts. The first part is they have to determine -- make a determination on the accuracy of the environmental impact statement. Is the environmental impact statement adequate. Next they have to determine whether they want to issue a permit to Minnesota Power for the Great Northern Transmission Line. If they do want to issue a permit, they then have to determine where that line is going to go, what the route is going to be, and what conditions do they want to attach to that permit to help mitigate and facilitate the proper construction of that transmission line. So that's the Department of Commerce's role in this thing.

And the main reason we're here tonight, in addition to having Tracy explain what the process is to you, we're also here to solicit from you information. I have to write an environmental impact statement. In this case I will be doing it in combination with DOE, as Julie explained. I need to know what the public and the local units of government want me to include in that environmental impact statement. So that's what I'm here tonight to solicit, some input from you folks.

Tracy went over and so did Jules went over the schedule. This is basically just another graphic of that same schedule. You can see we're at the public meeting. I think they covered that okay.

In Minnesota, for large energy projects that come before the Public Utilities Commission for a decision, there are two processes. There is the full process and the alternative process. The full process is a longer process, 12 months, plus three, a little bit broader in scope. The alternative process is for smaller projects, it's shorter in scope and length, it's a six-month process, but they have the same milestones in common.

The first of that milestone being a public scoping meeting and comment period. And

that's what we're doing tonight. We'll be soliciting at the end of my presentation your comments and there will be a comment period following the meeting tonight.

The second thing they have in common is a scoping decision. And a scoping decision, you can look at it as the table of contents for the environmental impact statement. And that's what I'm here tonight to get from you people, is to get input on that so that once my meetings are over, this road show that I've been doing the last two weeks, and then the comment period is over, I will take all the comments and I will, based on those comments, make a recommendation to my commissioner. The commissioner of the Department of Commerce is the one who decides what the scope of the environmental impact statement shall be, what the table of contents shall be.

Using your comments, again, I will make that scoping recommendation to him and he will release a scoping decision. That scoping decision locks in the issues and the alternatives that are going to be evaluated in the environmental impact statement.

The next step is the environmental review document. In the full process, the environmental

review document is an environmental impact statement. In the alternative process, it's a shorter process, the document is called an environmental assessment. It's a little smaller in scope and its procedures are a little different.

In the full process, once I do the environmental document, in this case it'll be a draft EIS, we will put it out for publication, for release so the public can see it, read it, review it. We'll notice that. And then we'll come back to this same area, do another road show, and solicit comments from the public on what do you think about the draft environmental impact statement.

And your comments may be, you may think that I didn't flesh something out well enough and you might provide me with additional information to consider or a reference to consider. Or you may think that I missed something, you know. So that's what that draft environmental impact comment period, that's what that's for, to get your input on the draft environmental impact statement.

Once the draft environmental impact statement comment period closes, we then start writing the final environmental impact statement.

And in this process the final environmental impact

statement is the draft document with a volume
attached to it in some way or fashion, it varies,
but it's the draft with a volume attached to it and
that volume attached lists every comment we got and
then our answers.

And our answers may be simple acknowledgement of the comment, or our response may be, wow, that's a good source of information, or that's good information you've provided, we've revised section 4.33, go back into the draft EIS and look at that. And when you go back into that you'll see striked out, underlined, and bold to distinguish between the original draft document and the changes that were made for the final. So those steps both the alternative and the full process have in common.

The purpose of scoping, the purpose of this public meeting again is to solicit input from the public. I want to know what issues and concerns you have. There are two ways that you do that. One is you suggest alternative routes to me, and the other is you suggest specific impacts or specific local knowledge you have that you want to make sure I cover that issue in the environmental document.

The scoping decision, when my commissioner releases the scoping decision, my role

has to have three components to it. It has to list all the alternative routes that are going to be addressed in the EIS, it has to list the specific impacts that the EIS is going to address, and it has to provide a schedule for when the draft EIS will be available.

The environmental impact statement.

Julie gave a definition, my definition is a written document that describes the human and environmental impacts of the transmission line project, including any alternatives that make it through scope that the public has put into the process, and methods to mitigate the impacts that have been identified.

Since what I'm doing tonight is I'm asking the public to provide me some input, and the two ways you can put in input are, one, on issues and concerns, and two, on alternative routes.

And as an example, when you came in in the beginning there you might have seen on the table a draft scoping document. This draft scoping document lays out what environmental review is under the state process, but it also gives you an indication, if you look at page 5 and 6 of this document, it gives you an indication of what I think the environmental impact statement should cover.

25

And most of these categories are very broad. what I'm asking the public to do is help me fill in the details of these categories. And the example would be, if you look at 5.13, the category is natural environment. That's a huge category. look at the subcategory, flora, plants, that's still a huge category. You might have local knowledge of something that you know that's along the route, maybe it's an area that you hunt or maybe it's a property that you own, or just a piece of property that you're familiar with. And you may know that there is maybe a deer wintering stand and old cedars that you want to make sure I address in the environmental impact statement, what's going to be the impact of the transmission line on that. Or you may have a plant that you know is in that transmission line, say the Lapland buttercup, and you want to make sure, Bill, I hike that area, I know this plant is there, it's rare, I would like you to acknowledge that it's there in the environmental impact statement and discuss what the impact may be on it and also how to mitigate that impact. So that's what I'm looking for when I say issues and concerns.

The second item, if you remember, is

alternatives. This one, I'm going to go a little deeper into this one because I think it's a little higher bar for the public to reach for and it might be what you're interested in.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you know of an issue that's within the route and, again, it can be that deer wintering stand, it could be some unique thing, something unique about it. It may even be on your property where the transmission line is crossing. there's some unique aspect there that you don't think that the utility is going to be able to build their transmission line without impacting. Even if they're using best management practices. Setting silt fences up, only constructing in the winter, having scheduled in planned, laid-out areas. the things they do when they build a transmission line to mitigate the impact they have. You may think this one thing you have, the ancient or the old stand of cedar where the deer winter or something that you don't think can be mitigated through construction methodology or practices, and you think the only way to avoid an impact is to avoid that thing. And in those circumstances you may want to say, I want to propose an alternative route or alternative route segment that goes around

that area of interest, that avoids it, pushes the route away from it, so that I know that thing that I'm interested in will not be impacted, because I think the only way to not impact it is to avoid it.

So that's what I'm looking for when I'm looking for alternatives. And since that's kind of a tough concept, I will provide some examples of it. The reason I say that the alternative is a high bar is because the rules state that if you want to put an alternative on the table that you want me to consider for the scoping decision, you need to explain why that alternative route should be included. In other words, what am I mitigating.

And an example of something that I don't think works is if you have -- if the transmission line is proposed to cross your property and you just don't want it to cross your property, you know, it's my property, I don't want it to cross it, I don't want to look at it, put it on Joe's property across the road, you know. That's not mitigating the issue. Your issue is I don't want to see it, but you're not mitigating it by moving it to Joe's property. What I'm asking for is if you give me an alternative, tell me why you are giving me an alternative, and what is it that you're mitigating.

And then you need to provide all the supporting data. Your maps, diagrams, your reasoning for it for me to consider.

And when I get these alternative routes or alternative route segments in, I consider what you're asking and that goes towards my recommendation to my commissioner of whether this alternative should be carried forward for evaluation. And I realize that's kind of a high bar, so I want to give you some examples of what I've done in the past.

This right here is a transmission line, a 115 transmission line that was being proposed between the cities of Tower and Embarrass. And you can see Tower to the north and Embarrass to the south, the transmission line as proposed was to run along the east side of 135, this road right here, okay.

Many of the homeowners that lived along this road had their driveways that went out to the road, their houses were set back a bit, you know, 50 yards or so, as much as you can stand the snowplowing, I guess. And the transmission line as proposed, the 115 line, would cross between their homes and the road.

There was a group of landowners who didn't like that, of course they didn't like that. But they also knew, they had local knowledge that the block of land behind them was tax-forfeited land, it was public land. So they came to me -- we did scoping, and they came to me and they said, you know, Bill, I want to couch this not in the terms of I don't want this on my property, I think I have a legitimate rationale, and that is why build a transmission line on private property when there's public property available nearby, relatively nearby. And that was their argument. So their argument was basically put it on public property, not private property.

That made sense to me, there was some rationale to that, I felt that that should be in the scope. I recommended to my commissioner to put that in the scope, he did put it in the scope. The scoping decision came out, the environmental review document came out and evaluated the impact not only of the proposed line, but of shifting that line over to that public land.

The environmental document came out, it went then to the public hearing that Tracy outlined we'll be following in this process, and then it went

to a final decision for the Commission. And in that final decision, the Commission agreed that they felt that was reasonable. That pushing that line to the readily available public property was reasonable. And when they issued the permit that's what they required the utility to do, is to build the transmission line along that public land.

Second option, second example. This is a project down in Chaska, down in the Twin Cities.

There was a utility that wanted to rebuild a transmission line. The existing transmission line, the purple line, was a 69 kilovolt transmission line that ran along this road. They wanted to upgrade that transmission line to a 115. So taller poles, higher capacity, a little bit wider right-of-way. There was a group of citizens who felt that building -- increasing the size of that project right in front of the historic building, historic property here, they felt that that would negatively impact the historic nature of that property.

So they came to me and they said, look,
Bill, we'd like you to consider two alternatives to
the proposed transmission line. The first
alternative was a route segment, alternative route
segment, and we call it an alternative route segment

because you can see the blue line comes outside the route. This light line here is the route, this purple line is the anticipated alignment or the right-of-way, which it was going to be 75 feet or so wide. But as they always do, they ask for a route, this one being maybe 500 feet wide.

Anyway, the alternative route segment that was proposed broke off, came down through the abandoned railroad line, followed the abandoned railroad line and then joined back with the original project.

Their second alternative was, okay, Bill, if that doesn't make it, we want to put something else on the table. And they suggested changing the alignment, where the anticipated alignment was going to be. They said why don't we push the alignment across the road and that way it won't impact the historic building.

Their argument had made sense to me because they were concerned about this historic building. I thought it was worth let's investigate that and evaluate that, so I recommended to my commissioner that these two alternatives be put in the scoping decision. My commissioner agreed to put it in the scoping decision, consequently the

environmental document included an evaluation of the impacts of these routes in addition to the proposed route. The environmental document came out, the process then proceeded to the public hearing and then proceeded to a final decision.

At the final decision, once all the facts were laid out, both from the environmental review and from the public hearing, the Utilities

Commission did not feel that the upgrading of the 69 line to a 115 kV line would have a negative impact on that historic structure and they approved a permit with the original proposal by the utility.

Another example. This one I think is near Floodwood. This is a 115 kV line, a proposed -- it was proposed to come up this east side of this county road and then turn and run along the south side of the county road. And it ran out far, this is just a little segment of it, but it's going out there. Anyway, the landowners here who had homes along the road didn't want the transmission line to be between their homes and the road and they knew from local knowledge that the property all along the north side here was corporate Blandin Paper, other paper company land that nobody was living on, it was corporate land. And they came

to me and they said, look, Bill, we think it's better for you to use corporate land, forest land, than it is to use residential private property.

That argument made sense to me. I recommended it to my commissioner, he agreed that this alternative would be included in the scope, the scoping decision. Consequently, it was then evaluated in the environmental impact statement, went through the public hearing.

, and at the end when the Public
Utilities Commission had all the facts laid out
before them, both the environmental review and the
public hearing information, they did issue a
transmission line with the route along the north
side of that road.

Another example. This one is also down near Floodwood. This is a rebuild of a 69 line again. There was a -- oh, boy. There was a 69 kV line running up the west side of this county road. The utility wanted to upgrade that to a 115. Again, taller poles, more capacity, a little wider right-of-way. There was a local property owner family who had a family memorial just outside of the right-of-way of the 69 line. And they were worried that, you know, Bill, the expansion of this

right-of-way, the higher poles, we're worried about that negatively impacting on our memorial, the memorial that they had down there.

That made sense to me that that needed to be further evaluated so I recommended that to my commissioner. It made it to the scope.

Consequently it made it into the environmental review document. Went through the public hearing.

And at the end, when all the facts were laid out with the Commission, both the environmental review and the public hearing record, the Commission permitted -- they did not feel that, once they looked at all the measurements, the photographic renderings, all of the information in the EIS that laid out the potential impact of the rebuild and the memorial, they didn't feel that that rebuild would have a negative impact on the memorial and they granted the permit the way the proposal was and went down the west side of that county road.

Another example. This is in the Chaska/Waconia area. This is another rebuild. There was a 69 kV line that a utility wanted to rebuild to a 115. Again, higher poles, slightly larger right-of-way, more capacity. This is the existing line and where they wanted to build, where

they were proposing to build. The line, the 69 line was put in many years ago and subsequent to that the county had moved -- and it ran along County Road 34. But subsequent to that line being put in, the county realigned that road and moved it up here, but didn't move the line, didn't move the 69 line, but just moved the road up here.

These landowners along here came to me and said, look, Bill they have to tear this thing down and rebuild, why don't they realign it back to the road? That made sense to me. I recommended it to my commissioner. It made it into scope. It was therefore covered under the environmental review document. It went through the public hearing.

And at the end, the Commission, with all the facts laid out, the environmental review, the public hearing information, they issued a permit requiring the new transmission line to follow the right-of-way of that County Road 34.

So that's what I mean when I'm looking -I wanted to give you a perspective of what I'm
looking at when I'm looking at alternatives and the
reason why we look at alternatives and we want to
take your input on alternatives.

We do have -- if you have such a

 situation and, you know, Bill, I'm starting to think about this and maybe I need a little help with it, we do have GIS stations set up down here. And after people are done talking you can certainly come down here with Gerry, and he can pull up your interest. If it's a property you're interested in, he can pull up various layers of all the GIS information, show you all that, and he can help identify what your concern is and maybe help you come up with, if an alternative is what you're looking for, an alternative to go around it.

So I was trying to give you an idea of bringing alternatives to me because I think that is a high bar for the public.

This slide here is just to show you, as Dave mentioned, this permit, this routing permit is only one permit that they need to actually construct and go forward with the project. They do need downstream permits and these downstream agencies, whether it be the DOT for a road crossing, the DNR for public land or water crossing, the MPCA for an erosion control plan, the law, the statute requires these agencies to participate in this program.

And this is just to let you know that I'm not working in isolation. And especially with this

one because I have the DOE that I'm doing a joint document with, with Julie. So I don't work in isolation, I look for feedback from our agencies, the agencies are encouraged to and they do participate, you know, so I just want to let you know that I don't work in isolation.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Downstream permits, Dave pretty much covered that. There are downstream permits, just as I said.

Information. There are -- in this particular project there are two state sources of information. As Tracy said, there's the eDocket source, which I consider sort of more of a professional tool, and then there is the Department of Commerce's energy page where we track the dockets and we upload all the information, the public comments I get, the draft scoping document is up there, the scoping decision will be up there. A lot of the same documents as eDockets will have, but in a different format that may be easier for someone to navigate who's not into the game or into the legalese of an official record. Additionally, as Julie said, you have the DOE website that you can go to get information.

And, like I said, what I'm here to do

tonight is to get your input. I'm going to solicit your input. The comment period is open to August 15th. I know Jules with the feds, they have an August 12th date. But if your comments come to either of us by the 15th that's the cutoff date we're using.

You can mail your comments to me, snail mail, you can e-mail them to me, fax them to me, or you can go to our website and make a comment on it. You can do the same thing to Julie and the federal website. You don't have to comment on both places. You can if you want, but I want to show you that Julie and I are working very closely on this and your comment will not be dropped if you only comment to one of us. We are going to pool all the comments together at the end. But the comments must be in by August 15th.

With that, I think the main -- I hope I don't step over this -- the main portion of what I want to do tonight is I want to solicit some input. And one of the things that we had on the desk were cards to speak. And I always go from the cards first and then when I'm done with the cards I'll ask for a show of hands, is there anyone else who wants to speak, and that's how we do it.

Tonight, because we're in the auditorium, if I call your name, stand up, Julie will come to you with a mic, state and spell your name clearly through the mic, ask your question, make your comment. Try to speak slower than I do, I'm brutal to poor Janet.

But if you have a question I will try to direct that question either to the PUC staff,
Minnesota Power staff, or DOE staff to answer it.
We might not be able to answer your question completely tonight, but we'll make an attempt to, and then we'll make sure that that comment is covered in the record and answered in the record.

So, with that, I'm going to start with Carol Overland first. You called like three days ago.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Carol Overland,
C-A-R-O-L, O-V-E-R-L-A-N-D. I am the attorney for
the residents right here and the Not-So-Great
Northern Transmission Line. If you search Great
Northern Transmission Line you'll find the site
Not-So-Great Northern Transmission Line and you can
get some more information up there or updates. If
you'd like any help, shoot me an e-mail.

For comments on this specifically, when

we talk about equal alternatives, it's really important in this EIS to look at alternatives to what. Because the project is, you know, promoted as, you know, having a 250 megawatt PPA, a contractual obligation to build a transmission line, and how do you get an alternative to that? You know, it's economic based. So really what's the alternative other than to say something that will put money into our pockets. You know, what are you going to do that's an alternative to a contractual obligation. So take a very close look at that and very specifically identify what the need is so that they can come up with alternatives to that need.

Second, this is a huge transmission line. They are trying to build a 500 kV transmission line. Big, big, big. I heard it represented that this is for a 750 megawatt capacity. That's grossly understated. This is the same capacity as a line in New Jersey, Pennsylvania. It's huge, we're talking like 5,000 plus megawatts.

So the EIS should reveal the size of the line, the capacity of the line, and it should look at the, you know, emergency rating, that should be disclosed. And then as far as the EIS goes, the EMF calculation should involve a range of potential

capacities, from what they say from zero to what they say it's going to be to the emergency rating, which should have a full range of EMF.

And you should also look at the impacts of such a large transmission line just because it is so much bigger than what would be required if it were for a 750 megawatt need. It'll transmit a lot more than that, so take a look at that.

NEPA, you're not allowed to do that under NEPA and you shouldn't be allowed to do that under Minnesota's NEPA either. This line, in the studies, show it going from like a two configurations in the study areas. Manitoba, through Minnesota, through Wisconsin, around the UP and down in Detroit. And they talk about it being regional. So what are the impacts of this segment, if it is segmented, you know, we need to consider all of the impacts of this, this is just a small part of a much larger project.

Also there's an eagle take permit other transmission lines have that that I'm working on, and there's a lot eagles. I saw one on the way up here and I saw another one just right nearby, flying overhead. And eagles are killed by transmission lines, they are killed by transmission lines

1 regularly. So check out the 2 3 Not-So-Great-Northern-Transmission-Line.org if you 4 have questions about this, and if you'd like to be 5 on the list, let me know. Thank you. MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Carol. 6 Next on my list -- and, I apologize, I'm 7 terrible with people's names, so as I butcher your 8 name, if you recognize I'm talking to you, stand up, 9 10 Jules will bring the mic to you, state and spell 11 your name clearly. 12 Melvoy Marfield? 13 MR. JIM ATKINSON: It's Mattfield, I 14 believe. 15 MR. BILL STORM: Mattfield. Okay, could 16 be. We'll know in a second. 17 MR. MELOY MATTFIELD: I know in high 18 school I could never stand in front of anybody, but 19 I will now. 20 MR. BILL STORM: Please state and spell 21 your name, sir, and speak directly into the mic. 22 MR. MELOY MATTFIELD: My name is Meloy 23 Mattfield, M-E-L-O-Y, M-A-T-T-F-I-E-L-D. I have a lot of -- I have different 24 25 comments or concerns, but I'm just going to state my most important one to me.

I've read through the literature that was sent to me and I appreciate that so I could read up on the effects from magnetic fields and stuff.

But my biggest concern is children. The area where I live, there's lots of families, and I have a grandchild and more grandchildren coming up. And I read different things on it and it sounds, my interpretation, there is no definite proof on anything that it's safe or not safe.

I'm not going to read the whole thing,
I'll just read what I highlighted.

More recently, laboratory studies have failed to show such an association or to establish by logical mechanisms for how magnetic fields may cause cancer. They are saying it may cause it. And my grandchild and my future grandchildren, if it goes through, will be very close to it. And that's where I spend a lot of my time. My hobby is -- I got trails I've cleared throughout the years and I hope to be walking on it 20 years from now. And there's about a three-quarter-mile stretch that I keep opening year after year, and that's where I walk. I spend a lot of time, I go out there about nine months of the year. And if the power line goes

in that area, that route, it would be right over the top of it. I could not afford to walk over it, especially with the grandkids and their friends and future grandchildren.

I think I -- yeah, I don't -- excuse me. I don't understand the terminology here. It's about children. It says epidemiological studies have shown an association through magnetic field exposure and health risks for children. I don't know what that means, but it scares me. It says there's a health risk for children.

So basically I just wanted to state a few of these things. And I have a -- for both routes, I feel this way for both routes. But I wrote out an alternative route that I'd like to show you.

That's all I have. Thank you.

JUDGE SHEEHY: Thank you, Mr. Mattfield.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you,

Mr. Mattfield. Submit your comment to me in writing before the 15th on your alternative. If you need some assistance in laying that out a little better, certainly see Gerry down here. During the whole --well, during the whole process, but up to the comment period, if you need some assistance in how to phrase it or how to word it, certainly give me a

call and we can talk about it and walk you through it.

So thank you again.

Dean Sedgwick. Please state and spell your name.

MR. DEAN SEDGWICK: Good evening. Dean Sedgwick, D-E-A-N, S-E-D-G-W-I-C-K.

The comments that I have are related to a little bit different approach.

Does the EIS actually cover things like economics and economic liability and rate impact?

And I believe they do. And I believe there's a cost-benefit analysis that has to be done and my concern is who is going to do that?

I think that if you're doing it from the Department of Commerce that it is not truly independent of the agency that's there. Further, as you look at these, when we were involved with other public projects, things like we do with plants in this county, the utility generally performed the overall EIS preparation and then they were reviewed by the governmental entities or agencies. Why is that not the case now again?

And not to say that you're not capable or whatever, but it seems like from a clearly good

point of vetting information properly and transparency, or transparency in preparation, that the utility, in this case Minnesota Power, or ALLETE, should be the one that's the lead entity to perform this document preparation, and perhaps there should be a review that's done by the Department of Commerce. I don't understand how there's transparency that's really true if you, as an entity, the Department of Commerce, Department of Energy, are the ones that are taking care of this.

Further, how does this project at all enhance energy independence in the U.S. and in Minnesota Power? I think that's an issue that needs to be looked at.

And then how does this project overall enhance job creation or employment? What I see is that you're closing down plants and then the project comes about and there's nothing that really is a job creator here.

The certificate of need status. I'm not sure from what you said whether you already discussed that or not and whether it's already been passed. So I do have some comments about the certificate of need.

And then how overall does this project

really reduce costs to the public in the long run?

You talk about concerns and things, in reality

northern Minnesota has been a net job loser over the

last number of years and so I'm having a real hard

time equating where you're going with this overall

concept.

And then the other thing is does the EIS contain truthfully a cost-benefit comparison analysis of these issues and of the routing permits, or routing directions. I would hope that they are and I would hope that that really comes into play. There's no way that you can do all of the environmental assessments if you don't literally incorporate those into a cost-benefit analysis.

Thank you.

MR. BILL STORM: Okay. Thank you, Dean.

There was a lot there. So I will endeavor with

Julie to make sure that the record responds to some

of that. I'll try to hit some of the points.

On this project, the DOE and the DOC will be producing the environmental impact statement. We will be doing that through a consultant that we've put out an RFP for producing the document. We vetted and evaluated the people who applied for the RFP, we selected a contractor, and that contractor

is working with us to do the environmental impact statement.

We don't rely on the utility to write the environmental impact statement. We rely on the utility to provide 80, maybe even 90 percent of the data that we need for that document and we vet the data through our consultant to make sure that it's accurate data. But we do that for transparency. We do that because we don't want the public to think that the applicant can get to write their own environmental impact statement. Not anything against the applicant, but I don't want the perception that the applicant is spinning or steering the document.

The environmental impact statement is a factual document, it just lays out the facts. It will -- based on the scoping decision, it will look at the potential impacts and the potential issues associated with the proposed transmission line, both of them, and any alternatives that come up to the table. It'll look at ways to mitigate those routes and those problems with the routes, you know. But it will not pick a winner. It just lays out the facts.

And it is only one piece of the puzzle.

Like Tracy said, once the draft EIS is out and we take public comment on that and we're working on the final EIS, there will also be a public hearing going And this case is a contested case so there will be a public hearing portion and then an evidentiary portion, which is real formal, real official. That's where a lot of people's questions or concerns about cost and economics get vetted, at that public hearing.

When the public hearing is done, the judge, the ALJ, will take not only the record to date, that's all the public comments I got on scoping, the scoping decision, the environmental impact statement, the final environmental impact statement, and then all of the comments that were raised in all the testimony that was submitted during the hearings, she'll take that into consideration and then she'll make a recommendation to the Commission on this case. You know, on those issues the Commission has to answer.

There was a lot there, so I don't know if I'm missing any of it. Jules, do you want to --

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: In addressing the presidential permit decision, the environmental impacts of the proposed line, our decision is to

create an international border crossing, but we must consider the potential impacts along the entire route. Because if it weren't for the line it wouldn't be coming to us for the presidential permit so we're obligated to do that.

Part of the obligation in the EIS process, the EIS, Minnesota Power has provided us with information in the application and we do have to go back to them for technical information, but it is my job -- it is our job as regulators, not advocates of the project, to perform due diligence, and to have our NEPA contractors vet that information, make sure it's accurate, and make sure it is articulated fully and clearly in the document.

Again, the EIS isn't a decision-making document, it isn't the decision document for the presidential permit. We have other things that we have to consider. One of those things being whether or not this line is in the public interest. Impacts to the border related to national security, as well as the impact of this line, potential impact on electrical reliability of the grid. So it's a multifaceted decision with the environmental piece of it feeding that decision as one variable.

And we also have to be in concurrence

from the Department of State as well as the Department of Defense before we would consider issuing a presidential permit.

So it is multifaceted in the decision-making. This is the first step for us to really understand the environmental and human implications of what is being proposed and perhaps what our position would have. So it is a process, it is, as I say, our due diligence to make sure that we vet the information that we get and just not take it on face value.

MR. BILL STORM: Thanks, Jules.

Anybody from Minnesota Power, there was a lot buried in that, if you want to make a statement relative to it, please do.

MR. DAVID MOELLER: I think there was a couple questions on the certificate of need process before the Public Utilities Commission, as Tracy mentioned as well. We're still -- that has not been decided yet. We have public hearings, we'll be back in northern Minnesota in October, that's scheduled, then there will be an evidentiary hearing in November, and then followed by a report from the administrative law judge assigned to that case. And right now the schedule is for a Commission decision

in May of 2015.

And, again, I think that's true, that the process will address a lot of questions as far as cost-benefit, regulatory impact, those are questions that are being discussed and we're bringing information through discovery on those specific questions, kind of who's paying what for the transmission line, and as well as the benefits for Minnesota Power as well as the region as a whole. Which is part of the Commission's role in evaluating the statutory factors for a certificate of need.

And one other question about enhanced job creation. We did include in our certificate of need application -- I'm sorry, Janet.

We did include in our application a study that UMD had done as far as economic development impacts. And granted, there aren't jobs, long-term jobs from the project, but there are definitely construction jobs and other economic development enhancements from building a six to seven hundred million dollar transmission line in Minnesota, as well as once the line is completed there will be significant property taxes that Minnesota Power will pay on an annual basis to counties and states where the line is located. So there will be economic

development from that.

MR. JIM ATKINSON: 17 to 19 million a year.

MR. DAVID MOELLER: We estimate around \$17 to \$19 million annually for the transmission line.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Dave.

Okay. William Yuenger, Yuenger. Please state and spell your name, sir.

MR. WILLIAM YUENGER: Yes. My name is William Yuenger, Y-U-E-N-G-E-R.

Is it possible to get a map of the routes up on the screen? All right. If it's not handy, my comments pertain to a section of the alternate route, okay. The alternate route is the tail end there right before it goes into the Blackberry Substation right where your pointer is. That section where it crosses the preferred route and then it comes back and joins the preferred route again. That section passes through Balsam Township. And the corridor for that section, following places that fall within that corridor or immediately adjacent to that, there is a church, the corridor separates the church from the parsonage, the Balsam Fire Hall is immediately adjacent to that corridor,

the Balsam Township Community Center, along with the recreation complex that contains a playground, skating rink, ball field, tennis courts and the picnic area all fall within that corridor. Further south there is a medical clinic. And where the line crosses County Road 8 is the Balsam Store.

Those places will definitely be impacted by any construction and by the line itself. And, also, there are a number of homes, some fall right in the center of that corridor, that will be impacted.

The human factor has to take into consideration what that line does to property values. It is my feeling that there are a certain number of -- or certain percentage of the population that will look at a high voltage power line and say I want absolutely nothing to do with it, and if they are a prospective buyer of a piece of property, there goes your sale.

In addition to these factors, there is a portion of the line that runs from the northeast to the southwest, that angle across there follows an abandoned 115 volt, kV, corridor. In that corridor are a number of structures that were left purposely because they are osprey nest habitat. A 500 kV or a

1 500 K line, being much taller and above those 2 structures, are definitely going to impact those 3 nesting sites. 4 Thank you. 5 MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, William. Mark Lofgren. 6 MR. MARK LOFGREN: I have a written 7 comment I'd like to hand in for the record tonight. 8 9 MR. BILL STORM: Certainly. You can give 10 it to Jules. 11 MR. MARK LOFGREN: My name is Mark 12 Lofgren, M-A-R-K, L-O-F-G-R-E-N. 13 And for reference, that same map, it's 14 the same area I'd like to comment on my comments on. 15 If you want to refer to the map book it would be page 49 of 94 in the map book. 16 Page 49. 17 Regarding Public Utilities Commission 18 docket number E-015/TL-14-21. Dear sir, madam, 19 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 20 Great Northern Transmission Line Project. 21 Specifically, the human environmental impacts of 22 this project. No one wants this power line in their backyard. There are several issues I would like to 23 24 point out in regard to the western route, otherwise

known as the orange or west route as it goes through

25

Balsam Township. I believe it would have negative impacts on this small community as it would pass right through the business district. There are two medical clinics, one on each side of the line route. The Bergren Family Chiropractic Clinic to the east side of the proposed line is within the corridor. Bigfork Valley Clinic, which is a satellite medical clinic of the Bigfork Valley Hospital, is located to the west of the proposed line just outside of the corridor.

Balsam Township has a public park, the entire area of which is within the corridor of the proposed orange west route. There is a driveway through the park designated on a map on page 49 by road number T, Tom, dash 2030. At the end of this driveway is a baseball field.

Besides being used for ball playing, it is also a landing area for the Life Flight Air Ambulance Service. There have been to this -- they have been to this landing site four times so far. The first time was a promotional visit to make known their services to the local fire department. The next two flights were training sessions with the fire department. The fourth time there was a transport of a man injured in a logging accident.

This ball field, as well as the entire park, is within the corridor of the orange west route through Balsam Township. There is also a church, Balsam Bible Chapel, of which most of their property is within the corridor of the orange west route. There is also a main store, cafe, laundromat, construction company, fire department, as well as about 25 homes either in or very near this corridor.

All of the above are in Township -excuse me. All of the above are in Section 26,
Township 58 North, Range 24 West, or the very north
part of Section 35, Township 58 North, Range 24
West, or on page 49 of 94 of the map book that has
been published showing the proposed routes of the
power line. I would like to add that neither the
public park or the church are designated as such on
the map.

In summary, I feel the orange west route through Balsam Township would have a very negative human impact now and into the future for this small community.

Respectfully, Mark Lofgren.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you for your comment, Mark.

Roger Webber.

MR. ROGER WEBBER: Webber. Roger Webber, that's W-E-B-B-E-R. I'm on Highway 8, 5723, 8 and 16. And I have an airstrip and I'm building another airstrip and it looks like it's going to land in the wires. And I'm wondering why you don't follow more of the existing and some of the old lines, like the one that goes to the mine, if you need to cut off before the mine.

And, also, what I ran into in Central and South America is what they call the Trans-Pacific Partnership. It puts us dependent on another foreign country. I don't know why we want to make our power dependent on Canada. Even the Canadian citizens are a little upset that we are buying power cheaper than what they can, their own people. So if you want to look up the Trans-Pacific Partnership with Trans-Atlantic Investment Partnership, you'll see what that does for our country.

Thank you.

MR. BILL STORM: Okay. Thank you, Roger.

Minnesota Power, any comment? Okay. Again, thanks,

Roger.

Sally Sedgwick. Please state and spell your name.

MS. SALLY SEDGWICK: Sally Sedgwick, S-A-L-L-Y, S-E-D-G-W-I-C-K.

I think the way to start this is supposed to be, look, Bill. But, let's see, I'd like to -- I understood from the online discussion that alternate sources of power was also part of this. And I think that would fall under the alternative of no transmission line.

It's been my experience that the State of Minnesota and the utilities have not supported the concept of distributed generation for their power projects, which would provide with a reduced number of transmission lines. It's my opinion that this would be better for the state as a public policy and also for the logging industry.

Commenting on location and the environmental impacts. And, actually, this is kind of something I'm surprised that no one has brought up, but maybe it's just so obvious. That this particular area has tourism as its main industry. Logging is also the second industry. The logging is losing its importance, and tourism is gaining its importance. The power poles of 150 feet would tower above the trees certainly from across the lake. And there is the aesthetic value in -- or a negative

value creating these structures in the wilderness area. And there's also, as far as the open corridor, there's also a privacy issue for people coming for the wilderness experience.

So I guess my question is why is this transmission line not collocated with the transmission line that exists down near Highway 65? I realize it's kind of qualitative, but this spring, research was released about animals and discharge from high voltage lines, animals see this as lines of popping lines, that's according to the PBS article. Although human eyes don't pick up UV, and they don't see UV discharge. I've given a few references to Julie to look into it.

To me, well, it also states in other well respected articles, PBS and BBC, that the avoidance of power lines, which this causes, can interfere with migration routes, breeding grounds, and grazing for both animals and birds. And to me this is a very strong argument for collocating the transmission line along the route that's already being used and already is.

Thank you very much.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you, Sally.

I'm done with the cards, so now I'll go

through the default position, which is if there's anybody who wants to speak, please raise your hand. Anybody who hasn't spoken, first?

Okay. Carol, you can certainly have another shot at it.

MS. CAROL OVERLAND: Let's loosen up the crowd a little bit.

I wanted to comment briefly on Mr. Sedgwick's things that he brought up. And that was about who's doing the EIS. And in a previous docket that I'd been involved with a couple years ago, a contractor was selected that had conflicts of interest in two locations. And it just so happened that at each of those locations, the existence or nonexistence of a transmission corridor was misrepresented in the DEIS. So have you vetted the contractor for potential conflicts of interest?

MR. BILL STORM: The contractor -- we did a joint search of RFP proposals, and both the feds and the state vetted the contractors for conflict of interest.

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: And that is required by federal environmental regulations issued by the Council of Environmental Quality, as well as the Department of Energy --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't hear 1 2 you. DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry. 3 4 said that is also, the conflict of interest issue, 5 is required for DOE to address up front by the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA implementing 6 7 regulations, as well as DOE's NEPA implementing 8 regulations. MS. CAROL OVERLAND: That's very good to 9 10 hear because that does not happen in Minnesota. 11 Thank you. 12 MR. BILL STORM: Okay. I'm going to ask 13 again. Anybody want to speak tonight? 14 Remember that you have until August 15th 15 to get your comments, issues, alternatives to me or 16 to Julie. We certainly have -- Gerry will stay here as long as you want to help you out with -- oop. 17 Okay, sir, if you'd please state and 18 19 spell your name. 20 MR. TOM BOLAND: Tom Boland, T-O-M, 21 B-0-L-A-N-D. 22 This just popped on as I was sitting 23 here. I lived in Steamboat Springs, Colorado for a 24 number of years and I lived right next to a 25 high-energy line on the side of the hill at the

bottom of the mountain. And I can remember in moisture incidents being woken up by a loud, loud, sometimes very loud crackling and popping. What's the incidence of sound pollution or sound with moisture? What is the proposed line, 500 kV?

MR. BILL STORM: Before I -- if Minnesota Power wants, but noise is, if you look in that draft scoping document that I have on the table, and you look through that draft table of contents, noise is one of the categories that we will definitely cover. We'll talk about the anticipated noise from a kV line under varying environmental conditions will be. And so you'll have the dBA, the decibels, how it is, and model it out to how far you have to be to be able to still hear that in its worst-case and best-case scenarios. Minnesota Power is okay with that? We will cover that in the EIS.

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: And, if I may, noise analysis not only looks at the operation of the line, but also potential noise for construction as well. So the associated activities, the analysis will cover all of those activities in construction and operation.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you.

We'll try again. Please, if you do,

that's what I'm here for. 1 2 Anybody else? 3 Please, sir, stand and state and spell 4 your name. 5 MR. ROGER WEBBER: Roger Webber, W-F-B-B-F-R. 6 7 There's one thing, where I live on this 8 ridge, we call it Lightning Ridge, it definitely 9 gets struck by lightening. I have so many fuses 10 blown to pieces. Does that have any effect on a 11 power line? MR. BILL STORM: I know -- I'm not an 12 13 electrical engineer, I'm a chemist, but I know the 14 transmission lines have, you know, grounding 15 protections. But, certainly, Jim, if you want to 16 elaborate on that? Putting you on the spot. 17 MR. JIM ATKINSON: I won't elaborate much 18 other than to reiterate that they are grounded. So 19 they're protected from lightning. If you want a 20 more detailed answer we have an engineer with us. 21 MR. BILL STORM: Excellent. Thank you, 22 Jim. 23 DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: And where is the 24 engineer, Jim? Right back in the corner. 25 MR. RYAN REED: I'd just like to say

1 that --

COURT REPORTER: I can't hear you, you're going to have to wait for the mic.

MR. RYAN REED: Ryan Reed, R-E-E-D,
Department of Natural Resources. I'm in the
northeast region, representing Itasca and
Koochiching Counties. And I'm here if folks have
any questions of the DNR. The DNR has provided
early coordination comments to the process so far,
so I'll hang around for a while afterwards, so come
talk to me if you need to.

MR. BILL STORM: I appreciate that, Ryan. Thank you very much.

Okay. Anybody else want to speak, ask a question?

The gentleman in the back. We'll go this way first. Sir, go ahead, state and spell your name, please, and then we'll get to the gentleman in the back.

MR. MELOY MATTFIELD: Meloy Mattfield.

Same as before.

These two gentlemen in here, Mr. Yuenger and Mr. Lofgren, I believe, when they were talking -- I don't know them, but we live in the same area, we're neighbors. I don't know them

1 personally. But they, when I made the comment about 2 children, I'm concerned about children and the effects of magnetism or whatever, that is the same 3 4 area I live, what they were talking about. 5 church and everything. So there's a lot of -- it's a large community and there is basically children 6 7 there, so I would like to comment, what they had to say, that is where I live on that orange route. 8 9 MR. BILL STORM: Thank you again for 10 adding that. 11 Gentleman in the back, wait for Jules to 12 get to you, and state and spell your name, please. 13 MR. DEAN SEDGWICK: Thank you. 14 Sedgwick, D-E-A-N, S-E-D-G-W-I-C-K. 15 Just a couple of short questions. One is who is the consultant that you 16 17 And how will you ensure that transparency 18 and correctness is actually adhered to and actually 19 part of the overall process? In the past I've seen 20 some instances where that's not always been the case 21 for whatever reason. So how are you going to 22 guarantee to the public there is transparency? 23 Thank you. MR. BILL STORM: Okay. 24 Thank you for

25

your comment.

The contractor that we awarded the contract to is Barr Engineering out of Minneapolis. They have some significant history in the state of Minnesota working on them.

As far as transparency, what I'm doing tonight, the comments that are generated, you guys will see, they will be posted on eDockets, on my website, on the fed's website. Everything we do is in the open. If we ask -- if we do an information request to the utility, you'll see what we're asking them and what further information we're generating.

The document will be produced in its draft form, we will bring it out, we will release it to the public. We will have a comment period on that draft EIS. All those comments will be available both online, on the various websites, and also part of the final EIS and we'll answer them.

Everything we do is in the open. We'll have a public hearing, it's open to the public, the public can come and ask questions. So we take great pains to make sure that the public can see what's happening. All the cards are on the top of the table.

Jules, if you want to add anything to that?

DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: I absolutely support what you said. I mean, quite frankly, the process in the National Environmental Policy Act process is defined by -- the basic principle it is built on is transparency and public participation, as Bill said, meaning that that information is publicly available. We let you review the draft environmental impact statement, help us correct perhaps inaccurate information, help provide us new information.

This is, you know, the federal and state agencies, the regulators, this is our job. This is how we exercise our due diligence and our function in our governmental role and we absolutely rely on the public in this process to help us get these things correct.

So really the process itself, as long as it's adhered to, which we absolutely will do and we are obligated to do and, quite frankly, it is something that I enjoy doing or else I wouldn't be engaged in this work. And it is something that is the right thing to do in terms of the federal government making a decision about a presidential permit.

MR. BILL STORM: Thank you.

1 Okav. Back to the pool again. Any -and, please, I mean, I'll stay here all night. 2 3 Okay. I'm going to go once, twice. 4 Remember August 15th, get your comments 5 in to me, get your alternatives in to me. Sit down with Gerry, he'll work with you throughout it. 6 7 Okay, sir. Please state and spell your 8 name. MR. TOM BOLAND: Tom Boland, T-O-M, 9 10 B-0-L-A-N-D. 11 Are any of these towers going to be lit? 12 If so, how many? 13 MR. JIM ATKINSON: Jim Atkinson. The 14 answer is no. 15 MR. BILL STORM: Okay. Back to the pool. 16 Where was I? 17 Okay. One, two. Remember August 15th. 18 You have my contact information, if you need help 19 getting a thought out or you need help with an 20 alternative or you just have a general question, 21 always contact me. You can always contact me. 22 So I'm going to call that with three, 23 then. Going. 24 I really appreciate people coming 25 This process is all about you guys helping me out.

see that the record is fair and balanced so that when the final record gets presented in front of the Commission that they can have all the facts and all the sides to make a determination. Thank you for coming out and I'll see you again shortly, I'm sure. DR. JULIE ANN SMITH: And also, there are business cards at the check-in table where you came in, my business cards are there to contact myself if

you have any questions.

(Meeting concluded at 7:46.)